

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/61112>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2018-07-08 and may be subject to change.



BRILL

Letters by Rudolph Agricola; Adrie Van Der Laan; Fokke Akkerman

Review by: Marc Van Der Poel

Early Science and Medicine, Vol. 9, No. 2 (2004), pp. 166-168

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4130158>

Accessed: 19/11/2012 07:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Early Science and Medicine*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

few physicians themselves fully understood the new rational systems now available to them.

In one sense, this book's value lies in its appeal as a clear account of pre-modern medicine. This work, however, was not intended to provide a narrative, and while advanced students already familiar with the subject will benefit greatly from French's research, junior students may have a harder time with French's argument. While the topical issues illustrated by chapter titles such as "Hippocrates and the philosophers," "Galen," and "Scholastic Medicine," may appear promising to the junior student, chapter content may prove confusing unless one already possesses a healthy understanding of Western philosophical principles. Despite the difficulties students may encounter, *Medicine before Science* will provide an impetus for some lively debate for issues sidestepped by French, such as medicine as a profession, the extent to which understanding of philosophical principles existed among pre-modern society-at-large, and how other healers in the medical marketplace responded to patient demands for philosophical mastery.

Jill Meekins

University of California, Santa Barbara

Rudolph Agricola. *Letters*. Edited and Translated, with Notes by Adrie van der Laan & Fokke Akkerman (Neo-Latin Texts and Translations; Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 216) (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum; Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp. IX + 435 illus., bibl., indexes € 64.50 ISBN 90 232 3808 7 (Assen ed.) 086698 232 9 (Tempe ed.).

In the present book F. Akkerman, the most accomplished scholar of the Frisian humanist Rudolph Agricola (1444-1485) of our times, and his student A. van der Laan have joined forces to present the first modern edition of the correspondence of Rudolph Agricola, who was a pioneer of humanistic learning in the Low Countries and Germany and the author of one of the most important treatises on dialectic and rhetoric of the Renaissance. The result of their collaboration is a landmark in the study of Agricola and Northern European humanism in general.

The edition contains fifty-five letters, that is, the fifty-four letters known since Percy Stafford Allen's survey (in the *English Historical Review*, vol. 21, 1906), plus one which Akkerman and Van der Laan miraculously found during their reconstruction of the textual transmission of the letters. This is letter fifty-five in the edition, undated, probably addressed to Agricola's half-brother Hendrik, and preserved in a late sixteenth-century manuscript which does not contain other letters or works by Agricola. The research which led to this discovery was necessary, because Agricola did not collect and publish his letters himself. The textual transmission involves in total seventeen manuscript and fifteen printed sources. The editors provide a clear survey of the transmission and provide a complete and detailed bibliographical description of each of the thirty-two sources involved in the transmission (31-58).

Fifty-one letters of the correspondence are written by Agricola, four are ad-

dressed to him. The letters cover sixteen years, from the middle of 1469, when Agricola was a student in Pavia, until the end of 1485. Most letters are personal correspondence on a variety of subjects (including typically humanistic topics such as the study of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, friendship, ideas on good education), with a few exceptions, namely several letters of dedication (letter 5, dedication of Agricola's Latin translation of a French letter; letters 14-16, dedications of Latin translations of Greek texts by pseudo-Plato, Isocrates and Lucian; and letter 17, the dedicatory epistle of Agricola's pioneering treatise *De inventione dialectica*), and letter 38, which is addressed to Jacob Barbireau and in which Agricola gives a model description of the humanistic arts curriculum and of its methodology, in particular the method of collecting material for writing by means of commonplaces (*loci communes*). This brief essay was often printed in the sixteenth century under the title *De formando studio*. The fragmentary letter 51 may also be a letter of dedication.

The correspondence gives us a good impression of Agricola's personality and of his contacts with Dutch and German contemporaries. Both the form and the content of Agricola's letters show him as the mature humanist that he was. They were written following the classical model of the *epistula familiaris*, that is, they are conversations at a distance between relatives or friends. The language of Agricola's letters is humanistic Latin, their style is always personal, yet carefully elaborated and varying according to the addressee.

In the introduction, two sections (in addition to the bibliographical description of sources used) stand out, namely the description of the language of the letters (13-24) and the quotations and echoes of ancient literature found in them (24-29). These two sections are notable, because they not only offer a good analysis of Agricola's Latin but also an excellent survey of the special features of humanistic Latin, including numerous references to the relevant literature. Surveys such as these are indispensable for the future study of the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of humanistic Latin.

The text edition as well as the accompanying translation and notes simply leave nothing to be desired: the text of the letters is conveniently subdivided into paragraphs, the classical citations and sources are listed, where necessary the critical apparatus provides clear insight in the details of the textual transmission, the translation offers the necessary help in reading the Latin, and the notes offer ample historical, linguistic and literary information to understand and appreciate the letters. Only in a very few cases did I think that some relevant information might have been added. For example, the note to letter 8, section 1, where 'lucubratio' means 'letter written by night', refers to Plin. Nat. pr. 24 as the only classical text that offers the meaning 'product of nightwork' for 'lucubratio' (286). However, Cicero uses 'lucubratio' precisely in the meaning used by Agricola in Fam. 9.2.1. And in the note on letter 10, section 4, one may perhaps usefully add Cic. N.D. 1.85, where 'sententia' is the translation of the Greek 'doxa' (289). Also, it seems that cross-references have not been systematically adopted where they would have been useful; e.g., in the note at 18.5 on the ablative ending of the comparative in -i, a list of the places where this form occurs in Agricola's letters (there are about six) would have been convenient.

A brief note on the orthography of the Latin texts is perhaps warranted. The editors have followed the orthography of the source selected as the basis of each letter's edition, because in their view, the original orthography vividly preserves

the texts as documents of their time. I do not wish to discuss the value of this view as such (though I would personally prefer to see a standardized spelling for the sake of clarity), but wonder why the editors apparently did not, in accordance with their own principles, preserve all j's and write 'u' or 'v' following the source used. Furthermore, the editors claim that there is no good reason for standardisation of the spelling, because those who are able to read and understand Agricola's Latin will not be hampered by fifteenth-century spellings (30 n. 127). But if this is true, the purpose of the glossary at the end of the book is unclear, given that it contains the Latin words occurring in variant spelling followed by the standard forms in the Oxford Latin Dictionary or Lewis and Short (424-5).

The bibliography lists all the works referred to in the introduction and the notes, and there are several useful indexes, a glossary, a survey of *clausulae* (metrical sentence endings) used by Agricola, and a list of minor variants. While these are all very useful research tools, there is one small drawback, namely the fact that the *Index nominum* does not list all the names mentioned in the notes, but only a 'reasoned and comprehensive selection' (409), and that the Index of Latin and Greek lists only a selection of the words, word combinations and syntactic features in Agricola's Latin and Greek discussed in the Notes. Also, it would have been useful to have a separate list of words not found in classical sources. One final, but certainly not minor asset of this important publication: the proofreading has evidently been done with extreme care.

Marc van der Poel
University of Nijmegen

Ian Maclean. *Logic, Signs and Nature in the Renaissance: The Case of Learned Medicine* (Ideas in Context 62) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. xvi+407, 12 half-tones £ 45.00 (cloth) ISBN 0 521 80648 8.

The title and the subtitle of this book should be reversed, for Maclean considers logic, signs, and nature only as they are found in learned medicine. He sets out to give an "ideal-typical" account of learned medicine from 1500-1630, that is, an account based not on the achievements of a few leading figures but on an analysis of all those whose works were known through publication. He does this first by putting medical doctors into the context of institutions, especially university faculties of medicine, their curricula, and their relations to the arts course, and by discussing the ways in which medical knowledge was disseminated, through travelling, correspondence, and publication. With respect to the latter we learn about the authorship, genres, formats, illustration, and distribution of books, especially at the great Frankfurt Book Fair.

Second and most importantly, Maclean discusses the content of medical knowledge. We learn about the range of medical doctrines discussed both with respect to types, especially anatomy and nosology (the doctrine of diseases), but also alchemy and astronomy, and with respect to schools, from Galenism to Paracelsianism. This is where we find a long and useful discussion of signs, for semiology or semiotic was an important division of medical doctrine, along with physiology, pathology, therapy and hygiene. Maclean appropriately relates medical discussions to Aristotelian and Stoic doctrines, rather than to the linguistic and